

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

DAVID LITTLE, II.,

Plaintiff,

v.

District Attorney RIGBY,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 5:24-cv-00131-TES-CHW

**Proceedings Under 42 U.S.C. §1983
Before the U. S. Magistrate Judge**

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS**

Presently pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for the Production of Documents ECF No. 9. Plaintiff’s request for discovery is premature. Nothing in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires the Court to grant Plaintiff’s request for the production of evidence prior to the Court’s determination that the Plaintiff has complied with the mandates of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 & 1915A and that Plaintiff’s complaint contains “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); *Schreane v. Middlebrooks*, 522 F. App’x 845, 848 (11th Cir. July 2, 2013). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s present Motion for the Production of Documents (ECF No. 9) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 2nd day of July, 2024.

s/ Charles H. Weigle

Charles H. Weigle
United States Magistrate Judge